

MINUTES
URBAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING

OCTOBER 31, 2013

- I. **Call To Order** – The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 2nd Floor LFUCG Government Center, 200 East Main Street, Lexington, Kentucky.

Planning Commission members present - Mike Owens, Chair; Eunice Beatty; David Drake; Carolyn Plumlee; Karen Mundy; Bill Wilson; and Will Berkley. Mike Cravens; Carla Blanton; Patrick Brewer and Frank Penn were absent.

Planning staff members present - Chris King, Director; Jim Duncan; Chris Taylor; Janice Westlund; Cindy Deitz; Laurie Jackson; Denise Bullock; Barbara Rackers; Tom Martin; Jim Marx and Traci Wade. Other staff members in attendance were: Tracy Jones, Department of Law.

- II. **Approval of Minutes** - The minutes of the October 10, 2013 Planning Commission meeting were considered at this time.

Action - A motion was made by Ms. Plumlee, seconded by Ms. Mundy and carried 7-0 (Cravens, Blanton, Brewer and Penn absent) to approve the minutes of the October 10, 2013 meeting.

- III. **2013 Comprehensive Plan** – The Planning Commission took public comment on the proposed 2013 Comprehensive Plan. The proposed Plan addresses all the Elements required by KRS 100, including: **Land Use, Transportation, and Community Facilities**. Additional Elements include **Economic Development** and **Green Infrastructure**. The **Goals and Objectives** for the Plan were adopted on May 17, 2012 by the Urban County Council. An **Implementation** Element will be considered at a later time.

Chairperson Mike Owens welcomed everyone to the meeting.

James Duncan - With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Duncan summarized the 2013 Comprehensive Plan process. The summary included a review of Kentucky Revised Statute 100 as it relates to comprehensive planning, the history of comprehensive planning in Lexington, and the process to create the 2013 Comprehensive Plan. The 2013 Plan process included 60 public meetings, focus groups, and citizen input meetings. The process started in October 2010 with staff research and early recommendations followed by development of Goals and Objectives, which were adopted by the Urban County Council in May 2012, and continued with the development of the remainder of the Plan that is presented today. A hearing to consider adopting the 2013 Comprehensive Plan is scheduled for November 14, 2013 following the Subdivision hearing. Once the 2013 Comprehensive Plan is adopted, staff will draft an Implementation chapter to be reviewed by the Planning Commission on January 23, 2014 and presented for adoption at a subsequent public hearing.

Mr. Duncan noted that this public hearing for the Plan was required by statute and was advertised as a legal ad in the Lexington Herald-Leader on October 15, 2013. According to statute, staff notified Planning Commissions and Military Installations in adjacent counties about the public hearing. Notice was sent on October 17 and October 28 to citizens and organization from the Division of Planning contacts data base. Mr. Duncan reminded the Commission that the meeting was being broadcast live on GTV3 and streaming live on the LFUCG Web site.

Mike Owens - We have ten people to speak. I am not going to go down the sign in sheet. I don't think time limits are necessary; if someone gets off track might try to rein them back in. We're not here to talk about an individual zone change or development plan. Everything is global as far as Lexington is concerned.

Dick Murphy - (attorney) He is not here on any particular client, but had general comments about greenways and infill. Greenways: There is a lot of discussion in the Plan about them, the need for them, and the location of houses in relationship to the greenways. Wants to ensure we are aware there have been problems with greenways especially in the Expansion Area. Developers have dedicated greenways, set the land aside; then LFUCG has declined or delayed acceptance of ownership and maintenance. He wants to make the Planning Commission aware of that and whether they want to address that in the Comp Plan. The expectations of the government have not been fulfilled although the developer's requirements have been. The Plan recommends houses face greenways, which brought a second concern about greenways in a natural vegetative state. Developers understand naturalized greenways filter water and serve as a water quality feature. There have been cases in the past where that has been done and complaints are made by homeowners that expect greenways to be cut down to two inches like their yards. There is discussion in the Plan about ownership of greenways, whether developers or the government. If given to homeowner associations there will be a great pressure to cut those greenways to the two inch level and that is not what they are designed for. If they are left to developers, they will have the same pressure to cut them down to two-inch level. There are complaints by homeowners to LFUCG about naturalized greenways. Hopefully the government can fulfill its role in accepting greenways and also have flexibility of where to site houses with the greenway. If we front a house on a natural greenway, people aren't going

to want to buy that house. They don't want to face an area which is grown up with cattails, tall grass, shrubs, etc. They want to face manicured golf course fairways.

He was pleased to see a lot of good language in favor of infill in the Comprehensive Plan. When the development community first was faced with infill a few years ago there was some resistance. The developers have bought into that concept and followed it. He is concerned that without the Land Use map in the Plan, it will be a little more difficult for infill where higher density is next to a lower density or across the street from lower density. The Land Use map helped in making that decision. Now we have some generalized guidelines; guidelines favor infill but there's enough in the Plan to say maybe infill is not appropriate. Infill is so important because it is the foundation of your plan. It's the foundation of preserving the rural area. That's where we are taking our additional population density, infill rather than expanding urban service boundary. Concerned about institutional memory once members of the Planning Commission/Council change and whether they remember what underpins infill and rural preservation. He is requesting additional language in this Plan emphasizing the need for infill.

Gregory Butler - (Chair for Greenspace Commission) read letter from Greenspace Commission- (see letter in meeting file)

Robert Wagoner - Has lived in suburbia all his life, half in Lexington. Over his career he has developed over 25 major projects in Lexington, including shopping center outparcels, and over a 100 throughout Kentucky. He used a map from older Comprehensive Plans to show how he identified and planned his projects. He said he has spent a great deal of time studying the first Comprehensive Plan. (Handout to Planning Commission and Planning staff- see meeting folder). Speaker referenced the 1931 Comprehensive Plan – automobiles, streets and parking in downtown Lexington.

Along Church Street there are currently nine separate parking lots and 14 different entrances to them. Imagine if you are an out-of-towner or a suburbanite asking, "Where do I go, where do I park?" This causes confusion to someone not familiar with our downtown. Our town is now at 300,000 people, accommodating more than 150,000 cars downtown. He was provided with Census tract summary on how our downtown is performing from a population standpoint. 1990-2000 population declined in core tracts. 2000-2010 we lost population again.

He has spent a good deal of time looking at our downtown and watching how it functions. We still have a substantial service delivery problem on Short Street. Our garbage and recycle bins are congregated on our sidewalks, right in the customer's view. At the time he didn't see how his outbound shopping centers had a negative effect, but does now. He made a map that shows how to make our city grow inbound. He thinks we need to focus on the female and make it more comfortable for her to come downtown, to park and shop. He is convinced we can make our downtown more competitive if we think differently about some of the "dirty" details: trash, service, delivery, and parking. If we had a small area development plan process that focused on these things, he thinks the community would step forward and solve these problems. We wouldn't have to reach out to consultants from far away places, we could do it here. We've done it at Red Mile and Reynolds Road; why couldn't we do it looking at trash, service, and parking?

Knox van Nagell - (Fayette Alliance coalition of citizens dedicated to sustainably growing our city and promoting our farms in Fayette County.) (Letter submitted promoting several additions to current 2013 draft- see meeting file). She respectfully requested that the Planning Commission advance the policies in the land use element and implementation phases of the Plan, understanding that additional resources might be needed for LFUCG's planning efforts- (see letter in file). They have shared these suggestions with Planning staff and stand ready to help with their implementation in the months and years to come. As a member of the Goals and Objectives committee and close observer of the land use element process they would like to commend the staff and the Planning Commission on the initial draft of the plan. The format and the language are clear; it concisely explains the growth challenges and opportunities facing Lexington over the next decade, in particular the need to advance a robust infill redevelopment program. By holding the line on expansion at this time, Lexington has a remarkable opportunity to become the model for sustainable growth by connecting and balancing its vibrant city with its unique and productive Bluegrass farmland. Through implementing this plan we can better address the changing preferences of Lexington's real estate market and sustainably leverage our built and natural environments through sound design, mixed use and mixed income developments, water quality repairs, infill incentives, and greenspace promotion. If we can rise to the challenge, our economy, environment, and quality of life will improve, giving Lexington an advantage on a competitive global stage. This is a transformational time in our community's history from our emerging downtown and special neighborhoods to our iconic Bluegrass landscape.

Tom Kimmerer - (chief scientist at Venerable Trees Inc) The Bluegrass is the home to the largest number of old growth trees in North America. There are more old trees here than any other place in the country: burr oaks, blue ash, shumard oaks. We've had a tremendous loss of these trees, including 90% loss of burr oaks in Fayette County in the last sixty years. He testified at hearing for Harvey property about the enormous burr oak. He is in favor of development because he is in favor of following Comprehensive Plan. He is deeply appreciative of the Plan for having kept the urban service boundary where it is. He thinks the plan does not strongly enough address the community's interest in preserving and maintaining these old trees. Ball Homes has made a strong commitment on preserving the largest of the burr oaks on

their property. We need to strengthen the language for preserving these ancient trees. He would hope between now and the time the final plan is approved we can strengthen the language and try to address this issue, so we can have these trees for many years to come.

Chas Hite - Thanked Planning Commission and staff for hard work on the 2013 Plan and for keeping the USA boundary where it is and expanding trails. He understands there is a commission studying the one-way streets downtown. He hopes when the time comes that the Planning Commission will refrain from changing anymore streets to two-way and considers restoring 2nd and 3rd Streets to one-way. One-way streets are more efficient, they can handle much higher capacity of vehicles, they are safer, much less conflict points between vehicles themselves, vehicles/bicycles and vehicles/pedestrians.

Andrea Strassburg - (member of Mayors Commission for Disabilities) She asked Planning Commission to please endorse the language in the Comprehensive Plan- Chapter 2- the accessibility language. She would like Planning Commission to consider endorsing the recommendation of the complete streets policy- Chapter 6.

Roger Damon - (LFUCG ADA coordinator and member of Mayors Commission for Disabilities) He also would like to strongly endorse the accessibility language that was included in the Comprehensive Plan. He thinks that the accessibility language that has been included is really something that can move our community forward to be inclusive to anyone that wishes to move to Lexington. He appreciates staff and everyone that has helped put this language in and recommends staff to take some of this language in Chapter 2 and move it over to the Implementation chapter.

Amy Clark - There is a lot of good in this Plan, a lot of time went in to it. She would agree it is an aspiration but it needs to be protective and defensive. This is a plan that needs to be conservative as well as progressive. It helps our communities keep what is good as well as advance to what is still better. This is the biggest, newest plan, it is very different, has a lot that is quite new to us. Often a Comprehensive Plan is called a road map to the future, but she is shocked and disappointed that the parcel map of designated uses has been eliminated. It has been the cardinal basis for Planning for quite some time now. What is to guide us instead, policies, a bundle of really ambitious, visionary policies and guidelines for every theme and prospect. A suite of small area plans has been suggested, have heard others suggested in addition. They are drawn up with toil, time, and expense for targeted areas. These are a good thing to have; let's not make them fragments for a lost whole. To protect neighborhoods it was suggested we could have ND-1 overlays and H-1 historic districts. These seem to be the only safeguards mentioned for established neighborhoods who want to preserve what is established in the neighborhood. Consider the staff time involved if these are really turned to as a major defense for neighborhoods. She prefers the older format of the plan where the land use is easily identified: the transportation, the community facilities. Her concern is that it is hard to judge what weighs most when things are mingled together this way.

The first question that is asked when a developer seeks a change is whether the proposed new zone in agreement with the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan is both policies and the map. But planners and citizens turn first to the map; the use is designated for each area, right down to the smallest parcel. If the zone the developer wants fits within the range of uses, getting the change is easier. If it doesn't fit within the range, he has to prove the Plan is out of date. He has to prove that the present zoning doesn't fit. It is a different process and standard if you have a parcel map. The proposed new Plan wants us to stop looking at the map; they want to take it away altogether. Instead there will be a great neighborhood scoring system to site and plan a subdivision, optimally with housing of varying densities, shopping and employment areas mixed together. There is a complete streets program to integrate the several modes of transportation that make good links between neighborhoods, work, and shopping and recreation areas.

She is concerned that some of these programs have been developed largely without public involvement. Their details aren't known to the public. Drafts are not available for review although they form part of this Comprehensive Plan awaiting approval from Planning Commission in mid-November. Please incorporate more of these drafts into the Plan. It is hard to see how the several policies fit together. What trumps what? Affordability? Context-sensitive design? Magnitude of investment? Density? Parks and trees? It would be nice at least to have our map back where it says these uses are designated for these areas. These policies and principles cannot replace a map of designated uses. In fact, they need a map to work well. What we are seeing in this Comprehensive Plan is an enormous and important mandate: save our Bluegrass. We are seeing essentially a map inside the urban services boundary and outside the urban services boundary. That is not enough of a map; it is much too simplistic. We need to see a more differentiated map.

We are having tremendous public involvement; this room filled with people coming down to zone change and development hearings. People are concerned about what is put where and how it is developed and how it looks. Many are going away disappointed and not coming back a second time when there is another decision to be made that affects their interest. One of the goals and objectives is public involvement and informed public involvement so citizens can have some power over their community and the kinds of development decisions that are made here. Too many citizens

are disappointed in recent zone change hearings because the parcel map of designated uses has been neglected and hasn't been updated. She suggests that if we really want citizen involvement in the public planning process, take out that map and point to anybody's neighborhood and say, "This is the place we want to put mixed use, jobs land, a shopping center, greenspace." If high density housing should ring our urban parks, which is one of the policy recommendations, put it on the map around that park. Put these uses on the map, try them out and get some community involvement. If mixed-use development is advisable on every corner where roads pass, that's a policy, put it on the parcel map of designated uses and see how the neighbors respond to that. If jobs land is wanted, put it on the map. What kind of jobs land and where?

Location, location, location; could anything be more important? Realtors, businesses, developers, homeowners and families know it. At a recent zone change the developers' attorney dismissively referred to the designated uses as mere colors on a map. She was glad to hear the Vice-mayor responded that these colors were anything but trivial. Our public servants and citizens worked hard to put them in place; they represent the traditions developed over generations, the promises to our communities and citizens that their neighborhoods, properties and investments will be protected. New developments will be governed by established principles; we will not take the road to the future without a map. Without a map to locate the needed density and development to best effect, how can we build up not out, save our Bluegrass, build within the urban services area, redevelop? She thinks it will all go to the south side of town, the wealthy areas. That can still be more valuable if you can find the small corner where no one has found yet and up zone it. The Plan designates the East End, Versailles, parts of New Circle and Winburn as areas that need a small area plan. How about looking at the parcel map and actually putting some of these uses where they need to be? It is awfully important to place the development more skillfully with more differentiation and discrimination than we have seen lately.

It seems to her that planning in the Comprehensive Plan for student housing area has been neglected. She thinks there should be more attention to it. Some of the conclusions articulated by the student housing task force have been addressed but a great many have not. There has been an explosion in population density around the university, both commercial dorms, dorms on campus, apartments and also R-1, 2, 3 housing in near neighborhoods. In the traditional subdivisions, they are suffering a hyper density in population, beyond what the public facilities can support. Paving and storm water are special problems. Home ownership in these areas has dropped precipitously. They have really lost affordability, not just homeowners buying in these areas but even rentals. Families can't afford to live in these areas. You get real instability when home ownership drops in an area. There are reports of block busting in some neighborhoods, where people are elbowing owners and long term residents out of their homes for the sake of consolidation and larger development. It is the outcome when there is not good planning and oversight. Finally, that large student population across the railroad tracks: It needs a grocery store, entertainment, restaurants, opportunities for fun, and it needs safe routes across the railroad tracks and Limestone to get to the University. In the student area, generally, among those who remain there as long-term stable homeowners, up zoning is not a welcome solution. Please keep our map.

Jim Gormley - He loves Fayette County a lot. He had to travel the world before he realized what a truly special place we have. He has seen what a lack of proper planning can do because he lived and practiced law in Atlanta for 13 years. He saw what happened to Gwinnet County Georgia when for 10 years it was the fastest growing county in the United States. He is troubled by the extent by which the economic prosperity is constrained by our land use plan. Amazed people aren't aware that 70% of the land is in the rural service area and 30% is in the urban services area. He thinks this has caused us some economic problems. He said because of the limits on land use for economic purposes around here, we found that by 2011 the median family income in Scott County was more than \$10,000 a year greater than that in Fayette County. In trying to preserve and protect our beautiful farmland, people talk about the number of jobs that these farms provide. You find that the average farm worker only makes about \$17,000 a year. A lot of these are not good jobs and they hurt our growth. He thinks that this group and the planning staff are aware of some of these issues. He said that in August 2011 the President of Commerce Lexington sent a letter to the Planning staff saying that Commerce Lexington was severely restrained in trying to get manufactures to locate plants in Fayette County because of the lack of land that is zoned manufacturing. According to this letter, Commerce Lexington did their own private survey and they could only find 75 acres made up of tracts of five acres or more in all of Fayette County that are zoned for manufacturing. We can never get, the way things stand right now, any manufacturer of significant size that would provide high-paying engineering and manufacturing jobs in Fayette County. He finds this troubling because it leads to several other problems. Until the past few years, Fayette County was much more prosperous than the rest of Kentucky. One of the places you could see this was the rate of childhood poverty in Fayette County was significantly less than the rest of Kentucky. As of two years ago the numbers are equal. One out of four children in Fayette County is growing up in poverty. According to a study from the University of Kentucky, in January of this year, the rate of violent crime in Fayette County is six times the national average for a county this size. He is focused on the connection on how our land use plan affects our economic prosperity. Another issue related to this, for the last couple of years the Fayette County Public Schools is looking for a parcel 50 acres or more to build a sixth public high school. They haven't been able to find it; you can't even build a school in the rural services area. He would like the Planning Commission to consider making some changes to provide for schools in the rural services area and to set aside or designate 1,000 acres in the rural services

areas for prospective manufacturers so Commerce Lexington might actually have a chance of attracting some manufacturer of significant size to locate here. He thinks that if they could do that that the crime rates will also come down along with our rate of childhood poverty. He thinks that the land use and the prosperity of this county are inextricably intertwined.

Jon Larson - (Fayette County Judge-Executive) He thinks most of the Plan we have is thinking too small and too limited. He is particularly disturbed we have allowed our urban service area to be joined to the Jessamine County line, disallowing for any buffer, disallowing any control in that particular area. The Fiscal Court is responsible for county roads; the resurfacing of county roads has not been redesigned since the merger in 1974. This may be impacted by the I-75 Nicholasville Bypass connector road. There are plans or at least some discussion of connecting Logana Road in Jessamine County to Tates Creek Road, which may connect to a number of county roads. We have an MPO in this county that only deals with two counties. By only having two counties we don't deal with the regional needs. Everything is interconnected in such a regional fashion. We haven't done enough in the way of regional planning. He is jealous of the city of Louisville. They have wonderful parks; we don't have these. We are trying to make small connections for the Legacy Trail but this doesn't quantitatively reach what they have in Louisville. It's just something beyond us at this point. We do have something that is greater than what they have: We have beautiful horse farms that might constitute a park, but these are private properties. Not only is there consolidated government in Louisville and Jefferson County as of January 1st there is a new movement authorized by statute called the Urge to Merge movement. They can consolidate or join organizations within counties such as sewer developments and fire. Many counties are into this, trying to group together organizations within a county. It is something we should consider. If you look at Brannon Crossing, it impacts Fayette County. Issues relating to flooding, schools, fire, police, and environmental protection should be planned on a regional basis. We have a group of planning agencies in each county mandated by statute. But we rarely work together. The statutes for this state authorize a regional planning authority. He thinks we need to go across county lines. Maybe we should plan for development in the area of Hamburg heading toward the City of Winchester. He is suggesting there is something else that can be done and maybe our land use plans are too limited in this community to be responsible to what we know is important, which is saving our horse farms and planning for increased population. He suggests regional planning is what we need to be thinking of and how soon will it be a necessity. Please adopt a plan keeping in mind that there are specific statutes allowing for a regional planning authority and some consolidation of county functions between counties.

James Duncan - Entered into the record letters that we received that were not presented to you today. They were received by email, with two forwarded to you. The third came after 1:00 p.m. today, which we'll send after the hearing. One letter is from the Bluegrass Trust for Historic Preservation signed by the Executive Director, one from the Homebuilders Association of Lexington signed by the Executive Vice-President, and one from Ball Homes signed by the Associate General Counsel/Development Manager.

Mike Owens - Closed the public comment section. Thanked everyone for their comments. There were some well-thought items that we will take under consideration. Open up for comments or questions from Commission members.

Will Berkley - Seems like there were a lot questions and discussions about the Land Use map. Would like to know what is proposed to replace the map. There is some concern that there really are no details on that yet.

James Duncan - Both the Long-Range Planning staff and the Planning Services staff believe the Plan as drafted provides more than sufficient guidance to make decisions about zone changes, from the goals and objectives to the details that are fleshed out in the various themes. Right now we believe you have before you a document that the Planning Commission can use, the developers can use, that citizens can use, and staff can use to make these decisions or recommendation and offer any sort of counter proposal to what is being offered as well. We also understand that having a more defined and focused set of criteria can help us all push away the elements that aren't important to the zone change decision and focus on those that are. The staff has been working on a set of criteria/guidelines that we would like to present to the Planning Commission for discussion and adoption into the Comprehensive Plan. We believe we can have those ready for the Commission and the public to review around the time we bring the Implementation plan to the Commission. In two months or so we would have that circulating for Commission and comment. Then we can see if that guidance is enough for us to make the decisions that are important for zone change. We hope to have those refined and in circulation in early winter, about the same time we get the Implementation plan to the Commission, so it can all be considered at the next round of public input and adoption for the Comprehensive Plan.

Will Berkley - In the event we adopt the plan, what would happen in the interim if we have any zone changes? Would we still use the maps or what will we be using in the event that we are faced with those situations?

James Duncan - We certainly don't want to imply that anyone needs to step back and wait until these criteria are adopted to pursue development. We want people to continue moving with their plans for development in the community. He and the Planning Services staff feel we can use the draft that the Commission has before them to make those

recommendations. The criteria will pull from that draft and perhaps make it a little easier, make it more of a quick reference. In the interim we are going to have to study it a little harder, negotiate a little better, but believes we can pull what we need from the existing draft to make those decisions. He believes that someone who opposes the same zone change can find something in the existing plan, too. That is going to make future proposals far less cut and dry. But we have already seen this. When people bring zone changes to the Commission that do not match the color on the map, we go through the process of getting to the end. We are going to have to spend a little more time with this, maybe more people here to talk about it. We are down to final 12% or so of the vacant land in the urban services area and maybe we do need to make sure we are looking at that with a fine point.

Bill Wilson - In small area plans, we have a listing of the areas. Will the implementation plan prioritize those particular areas? We have several areas listed that we are going to recommend small areas plans for. Which is first, which is the highest priority? Does that come in the Implementation?

James Duncan - To an extent we can prioritize that. We already have some funding to do the small area plan that is in the Gainesway/Centre Parkway area; we believe because that funding has been dedicated by the Council that we would advance early on. As far as the others, it might depend if we get additional funding to hire consultants to help us with those or we put them in as we are able to do them.

Bill Wilson - The ones we have identified are the ones we consider the top of the list, but this depends on where the money comes from. What happens if the money comes from another area totally outside of the ones we already have listed here? We heard Turfland Mall and Southland mentioned. If someone came forward and said we have the money, does that replace any of these or does that stick?

James Duncan - We would have to look at what were the goals of the planning process for another area that we haven't identified. We might find out that it turns out to be something like the Red Mile where we had not identified that as a small area plan in the way that the property owner envisioned. The property owner was the one that provided all the financial support for planning but they sought the Division of Planning to manage a public input process. So we assured that it wasn't just a development plan that the owner brought forward by including the neighborhoods in the process. If we get some more opportunities like that, like the Newtown Pike/4th Street Area, we would certainly try our best to fit into that process if we could. But it wouldn't necessarily be a small area plan that we adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan but an enhanced development plan that included considerable public input before being brought to the Planning Commission.

Bill Wilson - Do we have an appendices list?

James Duncan - Once we get the final draft, we will create a table of contents, an index, and definition section that show where things are in the plan. All the links listed will be "hot links", so the Web version will take you to those Websites.

Karen Mundy - She too is concerned about taking away the map. The map has given them a target to look at. She has had a few comments of concerned citizens and heard it today several times about taking away the map. Maybe we need to look at or review or reconsider or talk about it more before it goes away. Another thing that concerns me in this whole process is that we are looking at approving the Comprehensive Plan and we don't have Implementation on how that is going to work for a couple of months. It causes her real concern that they are going to vote on something and they don't know how it will be enforced or implemented. She is wondering why it is such a rush to adopt this before the implementation is in place.

James Duncan - All of the implementation tasks will be derived from the plan itself. At the end of every chapter is a box with bullets that has recommended policies/future action, which include over 60 items as potential tasks for this Comprehensive Plan that are already written into the draft. He doesn't know if all of them can be turned into implementation projects. Every thing that will be a project is already listed in the Plan in some manner, so there won't be new projects that come out that aren't already discussed or recommended for implementation in the Plan.

We don't think after three years of work that at this point we are rushing the Plan. This is a Plan that has been deliberate from the first day. It has been negotiated, it has been revised. We generally knew where we were going with this Plan almost from the beginning and stayed on that course. We believe the Plan is ready now, in the year 2013 with a title of 2013 we are ready to adopt this Plan. Adoption now should spur us on to the next steps to ensure that this Plan begins being implemented quickly. We think this is the moment to accept this Plan with the idea that we turn around and begin implementing immediately with an Implementation Chapter and the land use criteria being the first things that come back to the Commission.

David Drake - Some of the comments today--prosperity, development, income growth, he found very intriguing and somewhat alarming. Being fairly new to the Commission, wondered if we at some point in the past made the decision to forfeit or reject large-scale industry and live off the land of the surrounding communities.

James Duncan - Assured Mr. Drake that no statement has been made like that from the Division of Planning and doesn't think the government has said anything like that either. In fact, in establishing the 5,400 acres of Expansion land, 500 hundred acres was set aside for jobs and economic development, yet it sits there still undeveloped almost 20 years later. The same with Coldstream Research Park. We have hundreds of acres designated for high end economic development and it has been slow to develop. We also have traditional jobs land that is zoned I-1 that is vacant; we have lots of other I-1, I-2 and B-4 land that is underutilized and could be more than it is. The community has tried to make land available to accommodate the kinds of new industry that want to come to Lexington and that we need. The draft Plan recommends identifying barriers to development of Expansion area jobs land. Are there barriers that the government through policy or through money can help to overcome? We think it is extremely important to use that land for its intended purpose.

Chris King - That is a very top priority. By all factual calculations we have abundant land still in the urban service area for economic development. What we don't have is "shovel ready" land, which is what we really need in today's economy when you are dealing with limited manufacturing opportunities that typically are presenting themselves these days. We have been working very actively, our administration and our Commissioner are working on this very actively, to find out what are those barriers, how to overcome them, and to have a more proactive approach in the jobs land management.

David Drake - Of the available acreage, which apparently there is a fair amount, are there large tracts. Or is it numerous smaller tracts?

Chris King - We have both. We have hundreds of contiguous acres of economic development land in Expansion Area 3. There are numerous acres along Polo Club Blvd that have not yet been developed. The Implementation tasks will recommend that we continue to evaluate the barriers to developing jobs land. We know that just inherently our land is more valuable than many other counties, which is an immediate challenge. We have had a couple of recent situations where we have been working very closely with Commerce Lexington to place a company here in the urban service area.

Eunice Beatty - It seems to her that after working on this for three years, giving it so much attention and over 60 meetings, she didn't expect to hear anything really alarming. She really appreciated all the comments. She thinks this gave them an opportunity to go back and take another look at a few ways things are phrased and to strengthen some of the language.

Earlier in some of the planning sessions, she recalled discussions of when the Land Use Element was moved toward more of the narrative. While the map would go away we would still use some type of overlays: mixed development, green space, economic development, we would have an opportunity to see somewhat of a map. Is that still going to be possible? Is that something we may be able to use and explain in a more expanded way instead of the map, where people may feel a little more comfortable?

James Duncan - Some of those maps do exist and would continue to be references. For instance, the downtown master plan has its boundary. We expect even a subset of that, Design Excellence, to be coming forward and that would be its own boundary. We still have the Infill and Redevelopment boundary and that has its own inherent rules in the zoning ordinance. Those kinds of resources will still be available to us. Any sort of infrastructure map we need to advise us about location of future roads, trails, and parks would still be available and a resource to us. As a reminder, the reason we wanted to move away from the parcel based Land Use map is because in many cases it seems to limit the possibilities of what could be developed in those locations and still not have an adverse impact on what is already developed there. So we felt like by taking away the document we always went to first, we would look at the neighborhood in a larger sense and see what the impact of development would be. We're also interested in what problems we might solve by not being constrained by the Land Use map. We feel we need flexibility in order to accommodate our growth and development needs in the community.

Carolyn Plumlee - She thinks small area plans are costly and take a long time to do. It was mentioned about enhanced development plan. Would that help, because sometimes small area plans could be developed before the Plan is even finished? How would that enhanced vehicle work?

James Duncan - That was a word I used off the top of my head. Not really sure if we have a name for what we did with Red Mile or what we are doing with Newtown Pike and 4th Street. We are essentially assisting a person who is providing the funding. Those kinds of plans don't go through the same public process as the small area plans do. They do include significant public involvement, stakeholder involvement, stakeholder input and public input to help inform them. Then they essentially become development plans we expect to see in the future. In the case of Red Mile and Newtown Pike, they might result in a zoning recommendation for the existing lands and the vacant land around there. The Planning

Commission and the Council can use as a guide for how the development might proceed. Those are the things we like to be involved in but are not the same as small area plans which are really mini comprehensive plans.

Chris King - We heard a lot of good comments today. Staff, between now and the 14th will take a look at some of the major specific comments that were made and anything the Commission would like us to respond in a more formal way.

Mike Owens - In two weeks, the idea is to bring any additions, amendments, and changes back to the Commission for discussion and hopefully approval. Several good comments do merit some attention and we look forward to hearing discussion in two weeks. Next meeting will be November 14th, Thursday following subdivision items. Thank everyone for coming and providing their comments and thoughts. It's very important to the Commission to have the public comment.

IV. **Next Meeting For The 2013 Comprehensive Plan** – The Planning Commission will consider adopting the 2013 Comprehensive Plan on **Thursday, November 14, 2013** following the Subdivision Items Public Meeting, which starts at 1:30 p.m., 2nd Floor Council Chamber.

V. **Adjournment** – There being no further business, a motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 3:29 p.m.

Mike Owens, Chair

Carla Blanton, Secretary